

~~SECRET~~*Office Memorandum* • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Assistant Director for Operations

DATE: 4 December 1953

FROM : Chief, Foreign Documents Division

SUBJECT: FDD Publication of the Monthly List of Russian Accessions
and Operation of the Cyrillic Subject Union Catalogue

25X1A

1. I have undertaken to determine the cost of providing services in FDD covering subject functions now performed by the Library of Congress [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A

[redacted] This figure does not include a substantial amount necessary for the purchase of specialized equipment plus the undetermined expenses for additional space, heat, lighting, and supplies.

2. My offhand estimate before studying the problem was very low because it was not apparent in a casual glance that the project covered more than the Monthly List of Russian Accessions.

3. In spite of some savings, I do not recommend that FDD undertake the responsibility of assuming these functions for the following reasons:

a. The service is purely a library function and actually not within the objectives and mission of FDD.

b. The readjustment necessary to reorganize and establish the operation would tend to throw both FDD exploitation and the new service off balance until the complete change was accomplished.

c. The clearance of available Library of Congress personnel and recruitment to fill vacancies would be difficult and expensive.

d. The jeopardy to maintaining cooperation by the contributing universities and libraries now assisting the Library of Congress by providing full accessions lists.

25X1A

J. J. BAGNALL

Enclosures: 3

1. Memorandum to Chief, FDD, from Chief, Reports Branch and USSR Branch, same subject as above, dated 27 Nov 1953
2. File on [redacted]
3. "Monthly List of Russian Accessions," Vol. 6, #3, June 1953

25X1A

SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION

Chief, Foreign Documents Division

27 November 1953

Chief, Reports Branch and USSR Branch

FDD Publication of the Monthly List of Russian Accessions
and Operation of the Cyrillic Subject Union Catalogue

REF ID: (a) Memorandum to the Project Review Committee, through the
Deputy Director (Intelligence), from the Acting Assistant
Director, OCD, dated 4 June 1953, subject: [REDACTED]

25X1A

25X1A

(b) Letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress to the AD/CD,
dated 14 April 1953, same subject

1. In considering the possibility of the referenced operations
conducted by FDD the following are assumed:

a. That the publication of the MLRA would embrace the
complete operation and format of the publication now followed
by the Library of Congress.

b. That the MLRA publication and operation and the Cyrillic
Subject Union Catalogue would be unclassified.

c. That all sources of Russian publications and the reports
from the 57 contributing libraries, now available to the Library
of Congress, would be available to FDD.

d. That the composition, make-up, and printing, and basic
dissemination of the MLRA would be handled by the Government
Printing Office as at present.

2. Estimates on the operation required for publication of the
MLRA monthly.

Estimates for the language work involved, prepared by the Chief
and Deputy Chief of USSR Branch, FDD, follow:

a. Estimated monographs per month	650
b. Estimated periodicals per month	368 issues (225 periodicals)
c. Subject indexing for both	9,000 entries

Manpower requirements estimated for FDD to handle the above:

- a. One translator for monographs
- b. Five translators for periodicals
- c. Seven indexers
- d. One supervisor

SECRET

Manpower estimates for preparation of the project for publication.

- a. Two editors
- b. Five editorial clerks (typing)
- c. Two editorial assistants

3. In the interest of economy, the supervisory function for the publication of the MLRA could be carried out by the two editors, acting as chief and deputy, for this activity. Such editors would be required to have a competency in the Russian language sufficient to provide supervision to the translator employees.

The competency required for the processing of the monographs and periodicals is considered to require at a minimum the rating of GS-3.

If the indexing were to be handled as a separate operation, it is believed that the indexers employed should have a competency in the Russian language comparable to that required of a GS-7.

4. From these considerations, the following T/O and budget are submitted for the MLRA operation:

One supervising editor	GS-12	\$7,040
One assistant supervising editor	GS-11	5,940
Six translators	GS-9	30,360
Seven translators/indexers	GS-7	29,435
Five editorial clerks (typing)	GS-4	15,875
Two editorial assistants	GS-5	<u>6,820</u>
		\$95,470

5. Cyrillic Subject Union Catalogue

a. This estimate is based on the Library of Congress estimate of receipt of 25,000 titles per year. The Library of Congress idea to catch up with past accessions by doing two years' work in one, thus requiring a double staff, has been revised in this estimate in favor of a spread-out over two years. Under this plan the following T/O would be required:

One unit head	GS-11	\$5,940
One senior cataloguer	GS-9	5,060
Two cataloguers	GS-7	8,410
Three Cyrillic typists	GS-4	9,525
One typist	GS-5	2,950
One editor	GS-7	4,205
One file clerk (Cyrillic)	GS-5	3,410
One editorial assistant	GS-4	<u>3,175</u>
		\$42,675

SECRET

b. Completion of typing entries 1917-1992:

One unit head	GS-9	\$5,060
six Cyrillic typists	GS-4	22,050
One proofreader	GS-6	3,795
One typist	GS-3	2,950
One editor	GS-7	4,205
		<u>\$38,060</u>

c. Current biographical project

One cataloguer	GS-6	\$4,620
Two editorial clerks	GS-5	6,620
One typist	GS-3	2,950
		<u>\$14,390</u>

6. Recapitulation of total estimates:

MLA operation	\$95,470
Continuation of Cyrillic Subject Union Catalogue Project	42,675
Completion of CSUC	38,060
Current biographical project	<u>14,390</u>
Total	\$190,595

7. Considering reference (b), it will be noted that the FDD estimate undercuts those of the Library of Congress as follows: for the MLA operation, \$34,918; for the CSUC, \$21,889; for backlog typing, \$21,692; for the biographical project, \$10,844.

This shows a total FDD underbid of \$105,364.

It will be noted that administrative supervision has been disregarded in the above figures; \$16,021 was estimated by the Library of Congress for this factor. If the operation were carried out under FDD supervision it might be presumed that it could be conducted as an operation of the division without additional branch level supervision.

However, if this operation were carried out as an extramural activity of FDD, unclassified, it would probably be desirable to provide for some general supervision and administration. To this end the FDD estimate for the administrative supervision of all four projects is as follows:

~~SECRET~~

One chief	GS-12	\$7,040
One secretary	GS-5	3,410
One messenger	GS-2	<u>2,750</u>
		\$13,200

The addition of this administrative unit would bring the total estimate for the FDD operation to \$203,795, which would still underbid the Library of Congress figure by \$92,164. If ten percent for overhead and ingrade pay increases is added to this, the FDD figure would total \$224,175, which undercuts the Library of Congress bid by \$71,784.

8. The comparative estimate above makes no provision for original outlay for equipment and machines. The bibliographic and Cyrillic entries made by the Library of Congress unit are effected on Varitype machines and special Cyrillic typewriters. The Library also has equipment known as the Card Aligning Device. This enables the aligning of index file cards for direct photography and reproduction by the Government Printing Office photo-offset printing process.

To eliminate the employment difficulty or the necessity for training Varitypists, FDD could substitute the micro-Gothic elite typewriters for the Varitype machines.

9. The problem of original outlay required for equipment is but one of several considerations involved in any transfer of the Library of Congress operations to FDD. Others are:

a. The probable difficulty of maintaining cooperation of the 57 contributing libraries in view of the fact that a government intelligence organizations would be conducting the operation. Such libraries might feel that their arrangements for obtaining material from behind Communist boundaries would be jeopardized by such cooperation.

b. The best available source for personnel to conduct these operations would be the present personnel operating the Library of Congress activity. Such personnel would probably expect comparable ratings to those which they now hold. The recruitment of inexperienced personnel would involve the problem of training.

c. Transfer of the function from the Library of Congress to FDD implies a physical readjustment requiring additional space and the provision for the existing files and the expansion of such files.

d. Transfer of the function and physical relocation would be conducive to a gap in productivity of the operations which would contribute to dissatisfaction on the part of the contributing universities and libraries and on the part of subscribers to the MLRA.

10. The FDD estimates are predicated upon knowledge of foreign-language operations and reproduction methods. However, the combination of operations is essentially a librarian's activity and the complexity of such operations, as known to a librarian, conceivably could warrant the full estimate of cost as presented by the Library of Congress. Except for the MLMA operation, FDD lacks the experience on which to base really accurate estimates.

11. In view of the difficulties and problems noted above, and since the subject is basically a library function, it is recommended that FDD discontinue consideration of the subject operation as a possible expansion of its mission.

25X1A

[REDACTED]

Chief, Reports Branch

25X1A

[REDACTED]

Chief, USAR Branch